

REMARKS

The application includes claims 1-6, 8-19, and 24-27 prior to entering this amendment.

Claims 7 and 20-23 were previously cancelled.

Claim 26 is cancelled herein.

Applicant amends claims 1-6, 8-19, 24, 25 and 27.

Applicant adds new claims 28-35. No new matter is added.

Request for Continued Examination - 35 U.S.C. § 132(b) & 37 CFR § 1.114

Applicant is filing herewith a Request for Continued Examination. Authorization to pay the examination fee is included with this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Chiang (U.S. Patent 6,147,780).

Claim 26 is cancelled without prejudice. The rejection of claim 27 is traversed; however Applicant amends claims 27 to expedite prosecution. Amended claim 27 recites, in part, a system comprising:

means for moving said scan head along a second scanning direction to proceed with a second scanning procedure in a second scanning resolution which is higher than said first scanning resolution, wherein a second image is obtained from said second scanning procedure;

means for selecting a portion of said first image;

means for selecting an output resolution; and

means for operating on said second image to obtain a third image corresponding to the selected portion of said first image and the selected output resolution, wherein said first scanning direction is generally opposite to said second scanning direction.

Chiang discloses a scanner which takes samples from different positions in a forward and reverse scanning direction to increase its resolution. The Examiner identified column 2 lines 48 to column 3 line 10 as disclosing the first and second scanning resolutions. Chiang states that the “number of sampling units 25 of the scanner 24 and the gap unit D are determined by the resolution of the scanner 24.” Applicant remarks that while this passage suggests that different scanners may have different resolutions, it does not necessarily indicate that the scanner 24 is

able to scan at different scanning resolutions other than by controlling the number of times that the scanner is cumulatively operated in the forward and reverse directions.

Even if one assumes for arguments sake that the scanner 24 includes different resolution settings other than by controlling the number of times the image is scanned, Chiang fails to disclose a means for moving a scan head along a second scanning direction to proceed with a second scanning procedure in a second scanning resolution which is higher than a first scanning resolution, nor why it would be advantageous to do so. To the contrary, Chiang describes where the resolution is the same for scanning in both the forward and reverse directions (column 4 lines 62-63; column 5 lines 40-46; column 6 lines 46-51).

Claim 27, as amended, recites means for operating on said second image to obtain a third image corresponding to the selected portion of said first image and the selected output resolution. The Examiner cited column 3 lines 1-10 as allegedly disclosing obtaining the third image. However Applicant respectfully submits that Chiang fails to disclose operating on a second image, or indeed identifying second and third images. The Examiner has similarly failed to identify what images of Chiang disclose the second and third images, or for that matter the first image recited by claim 27. The recited section at column 3 does disclose first and second sampling positions, however these identify a gap unit D that corresponds to the resolution of the scanner 24, and not to first and second scanned images. Furthermore, Chiang fails to disclose means for selecting a portion of said first image. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Claims 28-30 are believed to be allowable as depending on claim 27 in addition to the further novel features recited therein. For example claim 28 recites the system according to claim 27, wherein said scan head moves in said second scanning direction prior to the selection of said portion of said first image. As Chiang fails to disclose the selection of said portion of said first image, it could not be understood to disclose a priority of said second scanning direction. Claim 29 recites the system according to claim 27, wherein said third image is generated without further movement of said scan head. Chiang, on the other hand, discloses repeatedly scanning an image in a forward and reverse direction to improve resolution. One skilled in the art would appreciate that the scanning module 18 of Chiang moves during each of the forward and reverse scans.

New claims 31-35 are believed to be allowable for similar reasons as discussed for claims 27-30, in addition to the further novel features recited therein. For example, claim 34 recites the system according to claim 32, wherein said scan head is configured to begin said second scanning operation prior to a selection of the output resolution. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of new claims 28-35 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-19, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Johnston, *et al.*, (U.S. 2003/0048487) in view of Chiang.

The rejection is traversed; however Applicant amends claims 1-6, 8-19, 24 and 25 to expedite prosecution. Amended claim 1 recites a scanning method, comprising:

- moving a scan head along a first scanning direction to obtain a preview image using a first scanning resolution;
- displaying the preview image;
- moving said scan head along a second scanning direction generally opposite to the first scanning direction to obtain a high resolution image using a second scanning resolution that is higher than the first scanning resolution;
- receiving input corresponding to a selected portion of the preview image and a requested scanning resolution for a desired output image; and
- operating on said high resolution image to generate said output image at the requested scanning resolution and corresponding to said selected portion of the preview image.

Johnston discloses a system that determines a best scan resolution for scanning an image based on either a destination data type or a user selected scan resolution value. The Examiner acknowledges at page 3 second full paragraph that Johnston fails to disclose a second scanning direction generally opposite to the first scanning direction, and instead cites Chiang to disclose these features. However for similar reasons that are provided with respect to claim 27, above, Chiang also fails to disclose moving a scan head along a second scanning direction generally opposite to the first scanning direction to obtain a high resolution image using a second scanning resolution that is higher than the first scanning resolution, as recited by amended claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 8 and 24 are believed to be allowable as depending on claim 1 in addition to the further novel features recited therein. For example claim 2 recites the method according to claim 1, wherein said scan head moves in said second direction prior to the identification of said requested scanning resolution. Johnston, on the other hand, discloses that a region of the

scanned image preview is selected before the final scan of the image (page 3, paragraph 0047). The preview image of Johnston, therefore, is selected according to the conventional scanning procedure identified in Applicant's background (page 3 lines 13-15) wherein the final scan is not started until after the user selects the desired scanning resolution. Chiang necessarily fails to cure the deficiencies of Johnston as Chiang fails to disclose any method of receiving input corresponding to a selected portion of the preview image and a requested scanning resolution for a desired output image as recited by claim 1 upon which claim 2 depends.

Claims 9-19 and 25 are believed to be allowable for similar reasons as discussed for claims 1-6, 8 and 24, in addition to the further novel features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-19, 24 and 25 is respectfully requested.

Any statements made by Examiner that are not addressed by Applicant do not necessarily constitute agreement by the Applicant. In some cases Applicant may have amended or argued the allowability of independent claims thereby obviating grounds for rejection of the dependent claims.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6, 8-19, 24, 25 and 27-35. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Bryan D. Kirkpatrick
Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-217